

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 22 are in the application and are presented for consideration. By this Amendment, Applicant has made changes to the independent claims to highlight the important combination of features of the invention, which is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicant also requests reconsideration as it is Applicant's position that the claims as now presented and as previously presented are not taught and not suggested by the prior art as a whole.

Claims 1 - 5, 7, 9 and 11 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kagohata (U.S. 4,829,884). The Kagohata reference discloses a blower 1, heater 3 and a plurality of temperature sensors 21, 22 and 23. With Kagohata, the heating arrangement is based on the use of engine coolant from an internal combustion engine. As such, the reference clearly fails to teach and clearly fails to suggest setting a heat output of a heater based on a sensor signal of a sensor sensing the airstream temperature of the heating arrangement.

As pointed out in Applicant's Request for Reconsideration, the prior art cited including Kagohata and U.S. 5,983,649 fails to teach and fails to suggest a heater having a controllable heat output. Instead, each of these references teaches a heat exchanger in which the engine coolant is used for transferring heat to air to be heated. As it is appreciated in the art, with such an arrangement there is no possibility of influencing the heat output. Specifically, the heat output of the internal combustion engine is based on the operation of this engine and there is no suggestion in the references of varying the heat output of the engine itself. It is noted that the Final Rejection of February 20, 2006 is silent with regard to this particular feature. There is no discussion of the heat output of such a heater and varying such heat output. Instead, the

prior rejection relates to a blower 1, a heating air temperature sensor 21, 22 and 23, the outside air temperature sensor 24, the control arrangement 20 and the mixing arrangement 10-14. As such, the prior rejection does not provide any rational as to why the person of ordinary skill in the art would depart from the use of the internal combustion engine with a heater that cannot be varied and provide a heater with a controllable heat output.

Applicant has revised independent claims 1, 3 and 5 to highlight that the heater includes a burner supplied with fuel and combustion air and generates heat. This of course is discussed in the specification (see for example paragraph [0018]). Besides the combination of features as highlighted in Applicant's Request for Reconsideration of April 25, 2006, the independent claims now clearly highlight the independent nature of the heater, namely a parking type heater namely the heater for generating heat as opposed to structures which use excess heat of an internal combustion engine.

Applicant's new claims 12 - 22 are similar to the original set of claims but further highlight the control structure of the invention, namely a control for carrying out a parking heating operation. According to the invention, when controlling the system in a parking heating operation mode, the heat output of the heater is controlled on the basis of the temperature of the heating airstream. The controller controls the system based on the output of the heating airstream temperature sensor arrangement and on the basis of the desired temperature of the heating airstream that is fixably set. This structure is disclosed in the application and is highlighted for example at paragraph [0021] which starts the explanation of the parking heating operation with this discussion continuing through paragraph [0023] wherein the desired temperature of the airstream leaving the heat exchanger arrangement is discussed. As stated

in line 2 of paragraph [0023], the value of the desired temperature of the heating airstream is set to a fixed, unchangeable value. This means that when carrying out the parking heating operation control, the air leaving the heat exchanger and being introduced into the vehicle interior space should normally have a temperature corresponding to this fixably set desired temperature. As highlighted in paragraph [0023], by doing this a rather high heating airstream temperature can be obtained, thus reducing the time necessary for preheating the vehicle when carrying the parking heating operation control.

The prior art as a whole fails to teach and fails to suggest the combination of Applicant's new claims 12 - 22. The references do not even disclose a controllable heater. The references clearly fail to teach and clearly fail to suggest a control that is carried out on the basis of the actual temperature of the heating airstream and the basis of a desired temperature of the heating airstream which is to be set to a fixed value. Kagohata clearly fails to teach and clearly fails to suggest a parking operation control.

Applicant requests that the Examiner favorably consider the claims as now presented. Favorable action on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
John James McGlew
Registration No. 31,903
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:jj/tf
71369-15

DATED: October 23, 2006
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-
0410.